THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

PAUL KAUFMAN, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS ROBERT M. SMITH SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM

Advisory Board

JOSEPH Q. ADAMS MYRA B. MARTIN
HARDIN CRAIG WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON
EDWIN GREENLAW ASHLEY H. THORNDIKE

VOL. 6 JULY, 1931 NO. 3

CONTENTS

O Jupiter, how weary are my spirits! (*Illustration*) ..... *Frontispiece*
Shakespeare on the Professional Stage, 1930-1931—*By Carl Carmer* 83
Saints' Oaths in Shakespeare's Plays—*By Robert Weston Babcock* 86
Shakespeare Dissolved—in Romantic Metaphysics—*By Robert M. Smith* 101
Some Emendations of Shakespeare's Text—*By Samuel A. Tannenbaum* 105
A Neglected Shakespeare Document—*By Samuel A. Tannenbaum* 111
Shakespeare (*Poem*)—*By Henry H. Hay* 112
How Shakespeare Made Trees Act—*By Charlotte E. Porter* 113
Recent Book Titles from Shakespeare—*By Karl J. Holzknecht* 119
The Annual Dinner 122
Annual Reports—The Secretary 124
The Treasurer 127
Membership Committee 128
Foundation Committee 130
The Curator 130
The Club Forum—*By Mrs. Robert Carlton Morris* 131

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 15 Gramercy Park, New York.

Subscription rate, $1.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, twenty-five cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription.

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to the Editorial Office, Atlantic University, Virginia Beach, Va.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary, Miss Myra B. Martin, 15 Gramercy Park, New York.

Copyright, 1931, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

O Jupiter, How Weary Are My Spirits!
(*As You Like It,* II, 4)

From *Three Comedies of Shakespeare,* with decorations, by Dougherty Harcourt, Brace & Co.
Reproduced by permission of the publishers.

Shakespeare on the Professional Stage---1930-1931

By Carl Carmer

THE early promises of Shakespearian productions for the dramatic season which ended in the summer on Broadway found little fulfillment. Last year at this time we looked forward to seeing Paul Robeson's *Othello* which had aroused London audiences (more accustomed than Americans to effective presentations of Shakespeare's plays) to unwonted enthusiasm. But the American negro actor failed to appear in his native land and has announced his intention of making England his home henceforth. Leslie Howard, for whose abilities, both Broadway and Hollywood have sincere admiration, intimated a year ago that he would soon be seen as Hamlet. His interpretation of the part to which all actors who believe in themselves and their work aspire is yet to be appraised. The American professional stage achieved the unenviable sum total of but one acceptable presentation of a Shakesperian play during the entire season, Macgowan and Reed's production of *Twelfth Night* with Jane Cowl as Viola.

This performance had the advantage of direction by Andrew Leigh whose familiarity with the traditions of English staging, fostered by his association with the Old Vic, enabled him to contribute much to the animated charm which characterized a unified and exciting production. Miss Cowl's lovely voice and her distinctive grace, which made her Juliet of a few years ago a memorable performance, found fitting employment in the comedy and her playing was ever understanding and clever without being excessively arch and whimsical—a fault easily committed. Further aid from England came in the person of Leon Quartermaine whose Malvolio was even above the high standard this veteran player has maintained through his considerable career. And, finally, the clowning of Walter Kingsford as Sir Toby and Arthur Hohl as Sir Andrew was spirited and sonorous — heartily appreciated by delighted audiences. Raymon Sovey conceived the sets as pages in a great book which were turned as the play progressed—a device which perfectly suited the mood of romantic farce. The whole performance was jolly and at the same time instinct with sensitive artistry. Now that Miss Cowl is considering a repertory company, it is to be hoped that both her Shakesperian portraits may be seen again and again.

Ten years ago Maurice Moscovitch played Shylock in London. His interpretation so caught the English fancy that he played it for almost a year.

Naturally, his appearance in the same role on Broadway, even though a decade intervened, was anticipated as a dramatic event. Never was greater disappointment. Critics and public alike found little to enjoy in the rather genial Jewish merchant, younger than has been the general conception, and much less conscious of racial antagonisms. It was all too obvious that the player had set his idea of the role against the purpose of the playwright. The result was a bit ridiculous.

While the two performances already described were the only new Shakespeare contributions of the professional season in America, the better repertory companies continued their good work. Eva Le Gallienne's Juliet remained a capital performance and her Civic Repertory Company improved its production steadily. Morgan Farley was a personable Romeo though his acting was little better than that of his predecessor in the role, Donald Cameron (who was pretty bad).

The Civic Shakespeare Society of Chicago continued on its triumphant course under the direction of Fritz Leiber. Its first season which ended a year ago was so successful, according to press reports, that it paid a net profit of $146,000 without drawing on the annual guarantee of $250,000 furnished by Harley L. Clarke. The announced repertory for this season included *Hamlet, The Merchant of Venice, As You Likt It, King Lear, Twelfth Night, Macbeth, Julius Caesar,* and *Richard III.*

America, with this meagre sum of Shakespeare productions for the season, was put to shame by Germany where Hans Rothe's admirable new translations have been an inspiration. A recent issue of *Proszenium* announces that *Macbeth* is being played in Karlsruhe, Altona, Oldenburg, Greifswald, Stuttgart, Cologne; *King Lear* in Nürnburg and Remsheid; *Troilus and Cressida* in Berlin, Vienna, Dresden, Mannheim, Leipzig; *King John* in Vienna and Leipzig; *The Merchant of Venice* in Leipzig, Mannheim, Kassel, Gera and Aachen; *Twelfth Night* in Leipzig (at two theatres), Munich, Düsseldorf, Dortmund, Karlsruhe, Kassel; *As You Like It* in Leipzig (at two theatres), Magdeburg, Meiningen, Hildesheim, Gera. This, on a foreign stage and in a foreign tongue three hundred and sixty-seven years after the playwright's birth, seems an impressive tribute.

Shakespeare's own country has honored him with only an occasional performance of interest. Playgoers were excited when it was announced that Gordon Craig and Charles B. Cochran had joined forces and were about to

produce Purcell's operatic version of *A Midsummer Night's Dream.* Mr. Craig, it was said, planned five full stage sets mounted on a revolving stage. Nothing came of this save rumors of dissension. The most effective of London's Shakespeare this season, the production I would have enjoyed seeing most, was *Henry IV, Part I* at the Old Vic with John Gielgud as Harry Hotspur. Gielgud, though a young man, has established himself through his Hamlet and this as one of the foremost of today's Shakespearian actors. Early in the season there was a revival of *Richard III* with Baliol Holloway in the name part. This and the *Henry IV* proved the high lights of the Shakespeare season.

Denmark, scene of Shakespeare tragedy, was recently made glad by cocktails, jazz and modern dress in a revival of *The Taming of the Shrew* at the Dagmar Theatre in Copenhagen. Henry Hellsen, the producer, so presented it, omitting the story of Christopher Sly. At the same time at the Royal Theatre in Copenhagen Johannes Poulsen who, two years ago, gave a spirited production of this play at the open air festivals at the castle of Kronborg, Elsinore, gave it an effective production in the traditional manner. Happy audiences wandered from one theatre to the other.

Other performances of Shakespeare which I would have particularly enjoyed seeing this season were a Russian production of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* in which the aristocrat, Falstaff, received his well deserved comeuppance at the hands of workers and their wives, and a production of *Hamlet* by the Turks in the Baku Oil region of which Anna Louise Strong writes "a version in which Polonius became an Eastern satrap, Ophelia a gauzily veiled Oriental damsel, and the ghost no wraith of a tormented mind but a solid kingly apparition in a silvery spot-light."

Little is left to be said. Prospects for next season are uncertain. England looks forward to the performances of the company of the rebuilt Shakespeare Memorial Theatre at Stratford, America to the Theatre Guild's promised revival of *Measure for Measure* directed and designed by Robert Edmond Jones, a production which was announced for this season but which was discontinued while still in rehearsal. Perhaps we shall have the Leslie Howard's *Hamlet,* and Jane Cowl in Shakespeare repertory. It has been a bad year in the professional theatre as in most businesses. Prophecies are worthless. Of one thing we may be reasonably sure—that we will continue to see Shakespeare played on the legitimate stage of America. The desire to produce Shakespearian plays, to play in them, to see them, has not abated. But producer, actor, playgoer alike are aware that the plays are a test of theatre art. They demand now, as they has ever done in the past, the best efforts of man.

Saints' Oaths in Shakespeare's Plays

By Robert Weston Babcock

MOST people, if ever they have thought about the matter at all, have, I suppose, assumed, when one of the Elizabethan dramatists made a character swear by the name of a saint, that the saint sworn by was chosen for the reason ridiculed by Ben Jonson in his play, *Everyman in His Humour,* Act II, scene 2. The lout Stephen is speaking to the Elder Knowell:

> "And then I sent her another, and my poesie was
> The deeper the sweeter,
> I'll be judged by St. Peter.
>
> *Elder Knowell.*—How, by St. Peter? I do not conceive that.
> *Stephen.*—Marry, St. Peter, to make up the metre.
> *Elder Knowell.*—Well, there the saint was your good patron, he helped you at your need; thank him, thank him."

Or readers may have believed that occasionally a saint was chosen for the sake of rhyme. That use, however, I have not found save in Jonson's *Masque of Owls,* where appears this couplet:

> "This Captain Cox, by St. Mary,
> Was at Bullen with King Ha-ry."

Here, of course, Jonson's hyphen shows that such use was illegitimate, and intended to be considered rather ludicrous.

Sometimes it is evident that a character is swearing by the patron saint of his country—by St. George, or St. Denis, or St. Andrew, or St. James, because these saints should have particular care over Englishmen, or Frenchmen, or Scotchmen, or Spaniards. Sometimes again it may be that the character is swearing by his own patron saint; but such a use is in reality the same as that Ben satirized, for, of course, the dramatist was at liberty to choose any saint he wished for the patron saint of his character, since the birthdays of dramatic characters are not usually recorded, to the confusion of later-day scholars. Sometimes, also, a character swears by the patron saint of his craft, as when, in Webster's *A Cure for a Cuckold,* Rochfield says: "Ay, by Saint Nicholas, lady, sweet lady, Rochfield is a thief."

But the very fact that that bitter satirist and unsparing critic of his fellow dramatists, gruff old Ben, saw fit to ridicule the meaningless use of saints' names in oaths proves that such use was common, and gives point to the theory set forth in this paper.

Contrary, however, to what, I believe, is the usual idea, oaths by the names of saints are not common in the drama of the period. In all the plays of Shakespeare, who used such oaths much more frequently than did his contemporaries, there are but fifteen such oaths, or, if we include an oath in the name of the Virgin, sixteen. In the plays of Jonson, Ford, Massinger, Webster, Tourneur, Marston, Middleton, Dekker, Beaumont, and Fletcher, to mention a few whose works I have already searched, I have found but 25 such oaths, and of these, eight are in Jonson's works.

But few as these oaths are, they show one of Shakespeare's points of superiority. Whereas most of the dramatists of the period chose the saint to be sworn by in the careless way indicated, Shakespeare invariably chose the saints his characters swore by for some reason, for some innuendo, some association of idea, some sly joke. I shall take up one by one the oaths by saints' names appearing in his plays and show that nearly always there is a remarkable parallelism between the situation in the play, or some allusion which the audience was supposed to understand and enjoy, or, for the use of one oath, an attempt to gain historical accuracy.

ST. ANNE (2 instances.)

The Taming of the Shrew, Act I, scene 1, line 253.

Whenever St. Anne is sworn by, there is some reference to sexual incontinence. In the present case, Sly, the beggar who, while drunk, has been put into the bed of a lord and told upon awakening that he has slept for fifteen years and is in truth a lord, is bored by the play that is being presented before him. His chief interest is in the Page who, he has been told, is his wife. In the Induction he has tried to persuade the Page to his bed, but has been put off by the excuse of physician's orders. His words in the following passage at the end of the first scene of the play have a direct reference to his impatience at his enforced abstinence:

> "*First Ser.* My lord, you nod; you do not mind the play.
> *Sly.* Yes, by St. Anne, I do. A good matter, surely; comes there any more of it?
> *Page.* My lord, 'tis but begun.
> *Sly.* 'Tis a very excellent piece of work, madam lady. Would 'twere done!"

Perhaps I should call attention to the play on the two meanings of the word "mind"—"to pay attention to" and "to be annoyed by." The first

servant says that Sly does not pay attention to the play, does not mind it; to which Sly replies that, emphatically, he does mind it, is annoyed by it. And his reason for annoyance is made explicit by his oath.

Twelfth Night, Act II, scene 3, line 127.

During a particularly boisterous scene of song between Sir Toby Belch and Feste the Clown, Malvolio enters to protest at their racket. Sir Toby is much incensed that a mere steward should presume to reproach him; but his particular resentment is to what he takes to be Malvolio's criticism of their singing when the latter says: "Is there no respect of place, persons, or time in you?"

After a little more singing, Sir Toby speaks as follows: " 'Out of time!' Sir, ye lie. Art any more than a steward? Dost thou think, because thou art virtuous, there shall be no more cakes and ale?" And the Clown adds, "Yes, by St. Anne, and ginger shall be hot i' the mouth, too."

Here the reference in the oath by St. Anne is made clear when one recalls that ginger was supposed to be an aphrodisiac. There is a definite connection between "virtuous," "St. Anne," and "ginger."

And that this innuendo in the oath "by St. Anne" was not confined to Shakespeare, I can show by at least one quotation from another source. In Henry Porter's *Two Angry Women of Abingdon,* Act II, scene 1, a young girl is eloping because of the objection of her mother to her marriage to the son of an enemy. She says: "Now, by St. Anne, I will not die a maid," there being, of course, a clear reference to sexual indulgence in this use of the oath.

The reason for the innuendo in this oath by St. Anne is not far to seek. When her husband Joachim was repulsed from a temple because he was childless and fled to the mountains to make his plaint to God, Anne cried to God to take away her curse of sterility. This God did. However, the error that Anne conceived without the action of man was maintained until condemned by the Holy See in 1677. But more important for our purpose, the question of the monogamy of Anne was a live one in Shakespeare's lifetime. In the sixteenth century arose an animated controversy over the marriage of St. Anne, the result chiefly of a sermon written by Father John Eck of Ingolsadt and published in Paris in 1578. This sermon stated that Anne was born to

Stollanas and Emerentia after twenty years of childlessness; that Anne, after the death of Joachim, married Cleophas; and that, after the death of Cleophas, she married Salomas. It is easy to see how, with such a record of three marriages, Anne might become a symbol for incontinence. And the question staid alive, for Samuel Pepys heard a sermon discussing it on February 19, 1659-60.

ST. GEORGE (1 instance.)

The Taming of the Shrew, Act II, scene 1, line 233.

There has been a passage of typical Elizabethan wit between Petruchio and Katharina, which has concluded with the words of Katharina, "Well aimed of such a young one," to which Petruchio has replied, "Now, by St. George, I am too young for you." In this exchange of repartee there seems, by the way, to be a meaning of the word "young" that I have not found given in the N.E.D. or in any other dictionary. And it is not differentiated in Schmidt. The first use of the word employs it in the good Elizabethan sense of "immature," "inexperienced," and hence "ignorant." But surely Petruchio does not use the word concerning himself in any of its recognized meanings. He is paying himself a compliment, and is not intending, I believe, to compare his actual age with Kate's. I suspect that there is in this use of the word something of the meaning of "youthfully vigorous," "nimble," and consequently, by extension, "clever." He is complimenting himself upon his nimble wits in this parry and thrust.

St. George, in addition to being the patron saint of all true Englishmen, was considered the pattern of manly youth and beauty. This is proved, I believe, by the following quotations.

In George Chapman's play, *The Gentleman Usher,* a drunken old noblewoman, whose character is sufficiently indicated by her name, Corteza, is speaking to an equally old lord, Alphonso, in the hope of making his thoughts accord with her own lewd hopes. She says: "I warrant you have much in you, if you would show it; see, a cheek a twenty; the body of a George, a good leg still——." Here very evidently St. George is taken to be the standard of youthful beauty and vigor.

In *Every Man Out of His Humour,* Act II, scene 1, Carlo Buffone says of Puntarvolo, "When he is mounted he looks like the sign of the George." The quality of the compliment must have depended, at least to some degree, upon the skill of the artist who painted the sign in question.

In the life of St. George in the "Golden Legend" the saint is twice referred to as a fair young man.

ST. FRANCIS (2 instances.)

Romeo and Juliet, Act II, scene 3, line 65.

Here Friar Laurence, a Franciscan, swears by St. Francis, the founder of his order. That in itself is, of course, sufficient reason for his oath; but besides there is a story of St. Francis which, it seems to me, we may easily assume to have been in Shakespeare's mind when he wrote the passage. Romeo has repaired to the Friar's cell on the morrow after his meeting with Juliet and tells the Friar of his meeting, ending with the words, "But this I pray, that thou consent to marry us today." To this Friar Laurence replies, "Holy Saint Francis! What a change is here; is Rosaline, whom thou didst love so dear, so soon forsaken?"

Here is the story of St. Francis, which certainly has elements similar enough to the situation to have suggested themselves to Shakespeare. In his early years St. Francis of Assissi gave no saintly promise. He was a gay, a witty, and a merry favorite with the young nobles of the town. He loved fine clothes and showy display. He spent with a lavish hand, and cherished military ambitions which resulted in his spending a year as prisoner of war. During his confinement he suffered from fever, which turned his thoughts to heaven; but returning health brought back his old habits; and Francis, having regained his freedom, started for the court of Walter of Brienne in search of military advancement. But a dream told him to turn back. This he did, and thereafter began to shun his former way of life. In fact, the change was so marked that, to quote the *Catholic Encyclopedia,* "his companions twitted Francis on his absent-mindedness and asked if he were minded to be married." To this he replied, "Yes, I am about to take a wife of surpassing fairness." To quote again, "She was none other than that Lady Poverty whom Dante and Giotto have wedded to his name and whom even now he had begun to love."

Is there not sufficient parallelism between this story of love and marriage and Romeo's to bring it into Shakespeare's mind when he wrote the passage quoted? But there is even more reason, perhaps, for the dramatist to associate Francis and Romeo: Francis, by his saintly longings, definitely estranged himself from his father, who, on getting him into his power, beat

and punished him. And Romeo, of course, was taking a step that was bound to estrange him from his father.

The story of the sudden change in Francis is told in the "Golden Legend" in the following words:

> "Francis, servant and friend of Almighty God, was born in the city of Assisi, and was made a merchant unto the twenty-fifth year of his age, and wasted his time by living vainly, whom our Lord corrected by the scourge of sickness, so that he began to shine by the spirit of prophecy ——. He loved poverty in himself and in all others, so that he always called poverty his lady, but when he saw one more poor than himself he had thereof envy, and doubted to be overcome of him. On a day he saw a poor woman and he showed her to his fellow and said: The poverty of this woman doth to us shame, and reproveth strongly our poverty, for, for my riches I have chosen my lady poverty, and she shineth more in this woman than in me."
>
> *Romeo and Juliet,* Act V, scene 3, line 121.

In the final act, just before the discovery of the catastrophe, when Laurence is hurrying to the tomb of the Capulets, he says: "Saint Francis be my speed! How oft tonight have my old feet stumbled at graves!"

Here, I believe, is an association of ideas with a story of St. Francis that is told in the "Golden Legend" in the following words:

> "A lady which had been devout to the blessed Francis died, and the clerks and priests were at the bier for to sing the exequies of her. She arose up suddenly off the bier, and called one of the priests that were there and said: Father, I would confess me; I was dead, and should have been put in a cruel prison, because I had not shriven me of a sin that I shall say, but S. Francis prayed for me, that this confessed and showed I shall have forgiveness, and anon as I shall have said and confessed it to thee I shall rest in peace tofore you all. And then she was confessed and assoiled, and rested anon in Our Lord."

This story is certainly strikingly parallel to the circumstances in the play: Friar Laurence is hurrying to the bier of a lady who, he hopes, if St. Francis is indeed his speed, will arise from it. She—that is, Juliet,—had been devout to St. Francis; she had a sin—her secret marriage—that she had not confessed; and she had been put in a cruel prison—for that as such she dreaded the vault is shown by her soliloquy in Act IV, scene 3; and she died and rested in the peace of our Lord.

ST. JAMES (1 instance.)

The Taming of the Ssrew, Act III, scene 2, line 85.

Baptista, the father of Kate, and his guests are awaiting the arrival of Petruchio, who is late for his wedding. To them enters the rascally Biondello, who announces Petruchio's approach with a vivid description of his disreputable appearance. The following conversation between Baptista and Biondello contains the oath:

"*Bap.* I am glad he is come, howsoe'er he comes.
Bion. Why, sir, he comes not.
Bap. Didst thou not say he comes?
Bion. Who? that Petruchio came?
Bap. Ay, that Petruchio came.
Bion. No, sir; I say his horse comes, with him on his back.
Bap. Why, that's all one.
Bion. Nay, by Saint Jamy,
I hold you a penny,
A horse and a man
Is more than one,
And yet not many."

There is here, I believe, a very definite reason for the use of the name of St. Jamy besides its making a half-rhyme in the doggerel. It was in Shakespeare's mind by the principle of association of ideas. Six of the main miracles of St. James of Compostela connect him definitely with a horse.

When the marble ship bearing the headless body of the saint approached the town of Bouzas in Portugal, a marriage was in celebration. The chief magnate of the village was the bridegroom. During the rejoicing, the groom's horse became unmanageable and plunged into the sea. The marble ship sailed over both horse and rider; but, to the astonishment of the townspeople, they both emerged safely; and to their even greater awe, the cloak of the rider was covered with scallop shells. Then a voice from heaven was heard to say:

> "It is God's will that all who henceforth make vows to St. James and go on pilrimages shall take with them scallop shells; and all who do so shall be remembered in the day of judgment."

Another miracle of St. James in which he is associated with a horse is told in the "Golden Legend" as follows:

> "It happened that one of them (thirty men on a pilrimage to St. James' tomb) was sick and his fellows abode and awaited on him fifteen

days, and at last they all left him, save he that promised not, which abode by him and kept him at the foot of the Mount Saint Michael. And when it drew to night the sick man died, and when it was night, the man that was alive was sore afraid for the place which was solitary, and for the presence of the dead body, and for the cruelty of the strange people, and for the darkness of the night that came on. But anon S. James appeared to him in the likeness of a man on horseback and comforted him and said: Give me that dead body tofore me, and leap thou up behind me on my horse. And so they rode all that night fifteen days journey——."—as all may read.

But these stories, even though there be horses in them, do not furnish the true association of ideas. Four other miracles were performed by St. James on a white horse. He fought on the side of the Spaniards at four battles; at the siege of Coimbra in 1064; at Logroño in the tenth century; in Mexico in 1521; and at Xeres in 1237. In each instance, of course, he won the victory for Spain. Here then actually are accounts of four times when the saint with his white horse, while not more than one, was sufficiently more than one to encompass the defeat of the enemy, when

"A horse and a man
Is more than one,
And yet not many."

ST. PAUL (6 instances.)

Richard III, Act I, scene 1, line 138; scene 2, lines 36, 41; scene 3, line 45; Act III, scene 4, line 75; Act V, line 3, line 217.

In Richard III, Gloucester swears by St. Paul certainly five times, and perhaps six. I have been unable to find any references to a story concerning St. Paul; but I can prove, I think, that Shakespeare used the oaths with a reason.

In Sir Thomas More's *Life of Richard III,* Richard continually swears by St. Paul. More's *Life* was the source from which both Holinshed and Hall took the material for their Chronicles, and Shakespeare in turn apparently took his material from Hall. In the *Chronicle* Richard swears by St. Paul in one of the incidents which Shakespeare used in his play. When Richard has tricked up an accusation against Hastings, he says to him: "Thou art a traitor." Then, turning to two officers, Lovel and Ratcliffe, "Off with his head! Now, by Saint Paul, I swear, I will not dine until I see the same." That incident and that oath are taken directly from Hall's *Chronicle.* Shakespeare was merely striving for historical accuracy.

Hall's *Chronicle*—"for by sainct Poule (qd he) I wyll not dyne tyll I se thy head of." The *Variorum,* p. 474.

More's *Life*—"The protectour bade speede him and shrive him apace, for by St. Paul, quoth he, I will not to dinner till I see thy head off." The *Variorum,* p. 237.

Holinshed's *Chronicle,*—"by saynt Poule (quod he) I will not to dinner til I se thy head of." The *Variorum,* p. 40.

The True Tragedie of Richard III (1594)—"For by the blessed Saint Paule I swear, I will not dine till I see the traytor's head."

In one appearance of this oath there is a discrepancy between the Quartos and the Folio. The question of the preferable source for modern editions of this play is much too complicated for me to handle here. But the problem here follows: Five Quartos of this play appeared before the Folio and before Shakespeare's death. In all of them, when Hastings announces to Gloucester that "the King is sickly, weak and melancholy, and his physicians fear him mightily," Gloucester replies, "Now, by Saint Paul, this news is bad indeed." In the Folio, however, he says, "Now, by Saint John, that news is bad indeed." Most editors seem to believe that the Folio is an earlier form of the play than that in the Quartos, but one that had been minutely corrected. The Quartos seem to offer, I believe it is considered, the preferable acting copy, the Folio a longer and more poetic and artistic but less actable copy. However, this question would seem to have little bearing on my immediate theory. But the *Variorum* shows that only one editor—Rowe—has preferred the reading of the Folio, "by Saint John."

Save the evidence from the sources quoted above, which may indicate authority, I can offer no proof that "by St. Paul" was Richard's favorite oath; but it is so stated to have been by Hudson.

I have tried to find some reason for the oath "by St. John," but since there are a number of saints John, I have had no lead, and there is nothing in any story of any of them that I have read that would seem to contain an allusion. Perhaps Shakespeare in correcting the play changed the St. John to St. Paul in order to maintain the historical accuracy; but, on the other hand, perhaps he changed it from St. Paul to St. John for the sake of variety.

ST. PATRICK (1 instance.)

Hamlet, Act I, scene 5, line 135.

The oath here used by Hamlet, "by St. Patrick," is to me a most interesting illustration of the sly way in which I believe Shakespeare used saints' names. Hamlet has just come from talking with the ghost of his father, who has assured him that he was poisoned by his brother Claudius and that he was not bitten by a snake as Claudius had said; Horatio protests at Hamlet's words and Hamlet replies, as follows:

"*Hor.* These are but wild and whirling words, my lord.
Ham. I am sorry they offend you, heartily;
Yes, faith, heartily.
Hor. There's no offence, my lord.
Ham. Yes, by St. Patrick, but there is, Horatio,
And much offence, too. Touching this vision here,
It is an honest ghost, that let me tell you."

The thought most prominent in Hamlet's mind concerns the falsehood of the serpent story: the snake has been driven out of the story as were the snakes from Ireland. I feel confident that there is a definite innuendo to that miracle of St. Patrick. Whether Shakespeare counted on his audience catching the allusion, whether he was merely chuckling to himself, or whether the name of the Saint jumped into his head by mere association, no one, of course, can tell; but certainly there is a very close parallel with the situation. And the offence is by St. Patrick. Such innuendo is in Shakepeare's manner, is to me a delightful bit of hidden humor.

Two other explanations for Hamlet's use of this oath have recently been offered, both of which appeared in the *Times Literary Supplement,* in the issues of January 9 and 16, 1930. Evidently some explanation is needed, for all the other instances in the Elizabethan drama of the oath by St. Patrick have been in the mouths of Irishmen who, the dramatists seemed to feel, needed to be identified by some means, for certainly the Irish brogue employed could not do it. The first explanation offered is as follows:

> "——But in the "Golden Legend," and in the "Festivall," books which in Shakespeare's youth were still lying about in households which favored the old religion, we have not only an account of the place of visions known as the "Purgatory of St. Patrick," but a story of how the Saint heard a voice from under the earth which came from a "paynim" who was buried below. Moreover, another legend of the same Saint, recounted by Joscelin and known even to Caesarius of Heisterbach, told how the man who killed Patrick's charioteer was cursed by the Saint and

died on the spot, but Satan occupied the body in place of a soul and walked abroad as if the man were still living ("corporis mortui habitaculum ingrediens quasi redivivum hominibus exhibuit")."
This was answered the next week by E. H. Synge:

"——We know that Shakespeare and his audiences looked upon an Irishman as the most irascible creature on the globe—'I will cut off your head,' says Shakespeare's typical Irishman, MacMorris, on the least provocation. The name of Ireland's patron saint thus springs to Hamlet's lips as a mark of his irritability, as an indication of the quality of his irritability. It is the irritability of an Irishman, for which no ground need be sought, and which will brook no answer.

"The sharpness with which the word bursts from him, marking a sudden turn of his humor—for that is what the word does—seems to me, at least, quite out of keeping with the scholarly explanation of your reviewer."

That part of the first explanation quoted which refers to the story of the buried paynim postulates the same principle of association of ideas as does my explanation; but the order of ideas seems to me reversed. It will be recalled that the incident of the ghost's speaking from the "cellarage" follows some thirteen lines after the death. I would suggest therefore that the oath came to Shakespeare's mind because of the association I have mentioned, and that the association with Patrick brought up the story of the paynim and suggested the uncanny speaking of the ghost.

The explanation by Synge seems to me to be answerable by the fact that in dramatists of the time most Irishmen are not irascible but humorous, ignorant, and fairly laughable footmen. How do we know that "Shakespeare and his audiences looked upon an Irishman as the most irascible creature on the globe"? And certainly Shakespeare had better ways to mark a character's irritability. And where else in this particular passage does Hamlet's irritability appear?

It remains to prove that Shakespeare might have been familiar enough with the story of the exiling of the snakes to have been able to make such a reference easily.

The story had appeared in Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon* in 1360, nearly two hundred years before Shakespeare's birth. There it is said that St. Patrick's staff was kept in veneration in Dublin as being the instrument

by which the Saint freed Ireland of the serpents. And there is told also a story of Patrick's having tricked one particularly shrewd old serpent by persuading it to enter a box to try its size; whereupon the Saint clamped down the lid and trundled it off, snake and all. I think that we may safely assume that such a story would become current and that Shakespeare would be familiar with it.

All that is said of this miracle in the "Golden Legend" is as follows:

> "Men say that this holy bishop, S. Patrick, did three great things. One is that he drove with his staff all the venomous beasts out of Ireland."

ST. JERONIMY (1 instance.)

The Taming of the Shrew, Induction, line 9

In the Induction to *The Taming of the Shrew,* the following lines appear. I am quoting from the Folio.

> "*Host.* You will not pay for the glasses you have burst?
> *Beg.* No, not a deniere: go by S. Ieronimie, goe to thy cold bed, and warm thee."

The Folio is the only source for this play, and the reading "S. Ieronimie" cannot be checked, therefore, against any other copy. It has given rise to considerable discussion. Theobald, in changing it to read "go by, Jeronimo —go to thy cold bed, and warm thee," inserted the following note:

> "*Go by S. Jeronimy, go to thy cold bed, and warm thee.* All the editions have coin'd a saint here, for *Sly* to swear by. But the poet had no such intentions. The passage has particular humour in it, and must have been very pleasing at that time of day. But I must clear up a piece of stage-history, to make it understood. There is a fustian old play, call'd, *Hieronymo; or, The Spanish Tragedie;* which, I find, was the common butt of raillery to all the poets of Shakespeare's time; and a passage, that appeared very ridiculous in that play, is here humorously alluded to. *Hieronymo,* thinking himself injur'd, applies to the King for justice; but the courtiers, who did not desire his wrongs should be set in the true right, attempt to hinder him from an audience.
>
> *Hiero.* Justice, oh! justice to Hieronymo.
> *Lor.* Back;—see'st thou not, the King is busy?
> *Hier.* Oh, is he so?
> *King.* Who is he, that interrupts our business?
> *Hier.* Not I:—Hieronymo, beware; *go by, go by.*

> So *Sly* here, not caring to be dun'd by the *Hostess,* cries to her in effect, 'Don't be troublesome, don't interrupt me, *go by;* and, to fix the satire in his allusion, pleasantly calls her *Jeronymo.* What he says farther to her, *go to thy cold bed and warm thee,* I take likewise to be a banter upon another verse in that play.
>
> *Hier.* What outcry calls me from my *naked bed?*
>
> But this particular passage of—*Go by, Hieronymo*—was so strong a ridicule, that most of the poets of that time had a fling at it."

Here Theobald cites four references, to which more could easily be added.

But this reading has not been uniformly accepted by editors, although the majority of them have accepted it, it is true. Delius and the Cowden Clarkes read "Go by, Saint Jeronimy," and Knight follows the Folio.

Jeronimo or Jeronimy was a variant form of the name Jerome. Now, St. Jerome (340?-420), one of the four great Latin fathers of the Church, was one the founders of monasticism and one of the strongest proponents of celibacy. He wrote *Vita Malchi, Monarchi,* which is a eulogy of chastity; and *Adversus Helvidium,* which combats the views that Mary bore children to Joseph after the virginal birth of Jesus, and that the marriage state is not inferior to chastity. In other words, he was strongly in favor of the "cold bed." Concerning St. Jerome the "Golden Legend" has several things of pertinence to say: "He was about mid-Lent taken with a sudden and burning fever, that all his body was cold, in such wise that there was no vital heat save a little which he felt in his breast." He recounted to Eustochium that "nevertheless I was oft fellow unto scorpions and wild beasts, and yet the carols of maidens and the embracements of lechery grew in my cold body and in my flesh, wherefore I wept continually." Yet, to his honor, he "remained a pure virgin to the end of his life."

Theobald, it will be recalled, said that the phrase "go to thy cold bed, and warm thee" was a reference in ridicule of a line in Thomas Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy.* That, I think it has been established, is not so. The same line appears in *King Lear,* Act III, scene 4, line 46. The Folio, followed by Knight, Delius, and Schmidt, reads "go to thy bed and warm thee," but all the Quartos and all the other editors read "cold bed." In the Variorum appears the following note:

> "This phrase occurs again in the *Ind.* to *Tam. the Shr.,* and in a note on it there THEOBALD thinks that, because there is just before it a clear allusion to a phrase in Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy,* this must also

be 'a Banter upon another verse in that play,' viz: 'What outcries pluck me from my naked bed?' But CAPELL is probably right in thinking this latter allusion more than doubtful, for, as STAUNTON says, 'to an audience of Shakespeare's age there was nothing risible' either in this phrase in *Lear* or in *The Spanish Tragedy*. 'The phrase,' continues STAUNTON, / " 'to go to a cold bed' meant only to go cold to bed; 'to rise from a naked bed' signified to get up naked from bed, and to say one 'lay on a sick bed' (a form of expression far from uncommon even now) implied merely that he was lying sick a-bed.' "

I think it is clear that this line was a proverbial expression and not a burlesque of Thomas Kyd. Now I ask if it is not in Shakespeare's manner to have Sly combine the satirized expression, "Go by, Jeronimy, go by," and the proverbial expression, "Go to thy cold bed, and warm thee," and then point the humor by changing to St. Jeronimy, with an innuendo to his passion for chastity?

The Cowden Clarkes, who read "Go by, Saint Jeronimy," have the following note:

> "In the Folio 'Saint' is printed 'S.' The 'by' before 'Hieronimo' in the line of the old play, makes the drunken tinker fancy it means an oath —'by Saint Jerome;' and instead of 'Go by, Hieronimo,' which he has heard, and thinks he is quoting, he jumbles the two together into 'Go by, Saint Jeronimy'."

My contention is, therefore, that this line should read as follows, as it is printed in the Folio, "Go by, St. Jeronimy, go to thy cold bed, and warm thee," the only change from the Folio being the insertion of a 't' after the 'S' to make the orthodox abbreviation of 'saint'.

This reading makes the punctuation correct, and is of interest in connection with recent Shakespearian research which asserts that the Folio is punctuated with a high degree of accuracy.

SAINT CHARITY (1 instance.)

Hamlet, Act IV, scene 5, line 59

In this song of Ophelia's appear the lines "By Gis and by Saint Charity, Alack, and fie for shame!" The only St. Charity of which I have been able to find mention was a young girl, one of three daughters of St. Sophia. Nothing is known of these girls save that they were supposed to have been mar-

tyred at very early ages, St. Charity when she was but nine years old. She appears again in *The Shepheards Calendar,* Eclogue V, line 255: "Alack! Alack! Ah, deare Lord! and sweete Sainte Charitee!" The line in Shakespeare sounds very much like a reminiscence from Spenser; or perhaps Ophelia's song was an old and well known one and Spenser's line is the reminiscence. At any rate, I suspect that the Saint Charity here mentioned was not the St. Charity of the Catholic Calendar, but that the word 'saint' is used in both places with a good deal of the original meaning of 'holy' and that Shakespeare's line really means "for the sake of Jesus and holy charity."

HOLY MARY (1 instance.)

King Henry the Eighth, Act V, scene 2, line 32

There remains to discuss but one oath, the only one of its kind in the plays—the oath King Henry swears upon seeing Cranmer left to cool his heels outside the council chamber—"By holy Mary, Butts, there's knavery."

There is, so far as I can find, no reference in this oath, no particular reason for swearing by the Virgin rather than by any saint. But the passage was probably not written by Shakespeare. According to Spedding, Shakespeare was responsible for only scenes 1 and 2, Act I; scenes 3 and 4, Act II; scene 2, Act III, ll. 1-203; and scene 1, Act V. This allocation of parts to Shakespeare substantially agrees with Fleay's, *Shakespeare Manual,* page 55; and Chambers, *William Shakespeare, A Study of Facts and Problems,* Volume I, page 496, says he sees no reason to dissent from it. And I believe that anyone familiar with the style of Shakespeare will agree that the second scene of Act V was written not by Shakespeare but by his collaborator, whether Fletcher or another.

Shakespeare Dissolved---in Romantic Metaphysics

By Robert M. Smith

MR. G. WILSON KNIGHT, in *The Wheel of Fire*,[1] has followed up his essay on the *Mystic Symbolism of Shakespeare* (entitled *Myth & Miracle*) with an interpretation of the tragedies that returns us to the unhappy metaphysical battles over Shakespeare waged by the German critics of the ninteteenth century. The book will attract those who wish the characters of Shakespeare resolved once more into philosophical and ethical abstractions, and who may be persuaded that the poetic soul of Shakespeare is progressively revealed through the great tragedies from *Julius Caesar* to *Timon of Athens*.

The ingredients and derivatives of Mr. Knight's romantic metaphysics are readily discernible. Take two cupfuls of Kant and three of Croce, two teaspoonfuls of Coleridge and one of De Quincey; mix together in the neo-Hegelian pot of the two Bradleys; bring to rapid boil on the wheel of fire, and finish off with a little extract of Bergson. On the basis apparently of the old distinction between *Verstand* and *Vernunft*—reason and intuition, the author discriminates been *Criticism* and *Interpretation;* the former is judicial and concerns itself with standards of values, the latter endeavors "to merge with the work of art, to receive the whole of the poet's vision and re-express the experience in its own terms." To achieve this feat one must eschew thinking in terms of time-sequence and causality, and become "purely receptive." Such a feat no doubt might produce startling results were anyone (least of all Mr. Knight) capable of performing it. What he actually does is to find in Shakespeare's plays Knight's metaphysical compound, and then to call it Shakespeare's. Instead of pure receptivity, and in the face of reproaches that he brings against those who indulge in historical and ethical criticism, Mr. Knight proceeds to reduce Shakespeare's tragic heroes to abstractions, and to valuate them according to their correspondence with his own metaphysical preconceptions. Just as the mind, he believes, is made up of an "intuition-intelligence opposition," so the Shakespearean drama exists spatially and temporally within the mind. The conflict between the two results in tragedy. Shakespeare's heroes are driven by absolute compulsions from the spatial or spiritual realm to sow disaster and reap death in the temporal world.

Hamlet, accordingly, appears in a new rôle as *Ambassador of Death,*

[1] Oxford University Press, 1930.

the essence of cynicism, negation, and loss of spiritual faith, who, exulting in his cruelty, murders all the wrong people; whereas Claudius, representing *Human Life,* is "a good and gentle King," whose pathetic prayer of repentance is "the fine flower of a human soul in anguish." Hamlet's ethics are likewise reduced to the level of Iago's, and Hamlet himself to a grinning Death's-head. It is doubtful if the degradation of Hamlet has ever been carried so far in the history of Shakespeare criticism. Mr. Knight, of course, is not the first critic to explain the illustrious Prince in terms of melancholia, abnormality, and disease. He follows here the footsteps of Bradley with a brief excursion into William James (though fortunately not into Freud) for psychological evidence; he is also not the first to whitewash Claudius at the expense of Hamlet, a task already more judiciously, though erroneously, performed by Howard Mumford Jones in *The King in Hamlet.* Mr. Knight's Hamlet, one may conclude, is as far removed as possible from Shakespeare's prince who has captured the admiration and sympathy of thousands. One turns in sheer defence to a passage like this from the sturdy Stoll:

> "If Hamlet was not an irresolute dreamer but an intrepid young prince who had fought off his enemies through the four acts, and now fell at the end of the fifth only after he had slain them all, then the soldiers' music and the rites of war, which Fortinbras orders for his passage are but his due."

The main and prevailing note in Hamlet, as Stoll points out, is not disease and defeat, but tragic triumph. It is inexplicable how Mr. Knight's Hamlet could have won the admiration of anyone.

In succeeding chapters Shakespeare's other tragic heroes are more or less violently wrenched out of themselves as living creations in order to typify the abstractions of cold philosophy. Thus *Troilus and Cressida* exhibits the defeat of the romantic, intuitive, beautiful, and divine (Troilus and the Trojans) overwhelmed by the realistic, intellectual, bestial and stupid elements of humanity (Cressida and the Greeks); *Measure for Measure* becomes a parable, like the parables of Jesus on the unrighteous judge and the supreme virtue of forgiveness, the Duke being "automatically comparable with Divinity," and the play reflecting "the sublime strangeness and unreason of Jesus' teaching"; Othello signifies *War;* Desdemona, *Love* or "the Divine Principle"; Iago, cynical *Intellect,* loathing love and beauty. Few readers will follow Mr. Knight either in his contention in Chapter VIII that Macbeth is the "Apocalypse of Evil" more absolutely than Iago who is "too purely intellec-

tual to antagonize our emotions powerfully." When one recalls that an actor playing Iago was actually shot in the theatre by an infuriated spectator, one may doubt Iago's incapabilities of antagonizing our emotions. With Chapter IX on the grotesque in *Lear,* which borders on comedy, we come to more illuminating interpretations, for whenever Mr. Knight foresees his metaphysical prepossessions and his efforts to fit the plays to them, he displays the discerning eye of a first-rate critic; nor does he, like many critics, bewail or blink the awful ending, but keeps upon firm ground:

> "The tragedy of *Lear* is most poignant in that it is purposeless, unreasonable. It is the most fearless artistic facing of the ultimate cruelty of things in our literature. . . . *Lear* is supreme in that, in its main theme, it faces the very absence of tragic purpose. . . . Yet, as we close the sheets of this play, there is no horror, nor resentment. The tragic purification of the essentially untragic is yet complete."

And later, discussing the reconciliation of Lear and Cordelia, followed by the catastrophic ending, he wisely does not attempt to resolve into metaphysics the philosophic quandary, but keeps it finely balanced: "Wherein shall we seek the revelations of Lear—in that deathless dream of love, or in his death?" Similarly Mr. Knight continues with a valuable interpretation of the many philosophical implications of *King Lear.* Following a suggestion of Bradley, and keeping his eye constantly on the play he traces step by step with great skill and painstaking reference the course of Lear's purgatorial pilgrimage from the natural to the spiritual. We shall hardly find a better chapter of analysis anywhere, though we may refuse to leap so far as Mr. Knight to the conclusion that Shakespeare's thesis in this play is the spiritual evolution of mankind.

The treatment of Timon of Athens in Chapter XI, and the last three chapters entitled *Shakespeare and Tolstoi, Symbolic Personification* and *The Shakespearean Metaphysic* are unsatisfactory and unrewarding, for once more the clouds thicken and the critic plunges again into metaphysical vagaries that not only darken counsel, but finally extinguish light. He tells us that "Timon at the end, is pure essence of significance, beyond the temporal, in touch with a conquering knowledge of his furthest destiny," and that in this play (generally conceded to be only partly by Shakespeare—a fact Mr. Kinght ignores) "the profoundest problems of racial destiny are here symbolized and fought out." He enters, moreover, upon extremely perilous ground when he attempts in Chapter XII to draw parallels between the spiritual develop-

ment of Tolstoi and that of Shakespeare as revealed by "the rhythm of spiritual development" he unconvincingly traces in the tragedies from *Hamlet* to *Timon.* The perils, as well as the futilities, of this quest have already been decisively pointed out in Professor William Tenny Brewster's *The Search for Shakespeare's Personality;* and it was not necessary for a critic versed in Shakespeare scholarship to encounter them. Mr. Knight draws to an end with more reiteration of the tragic heroes as symbols, and closes with a chapter on *The Shakespearean Metaphysic* that is not only self-contradictory and chaotic, but so far removed from our experience with the plays themselves as to be incomprehensible to all except those who have not already been consumed in revolving upon Mr. Knight's (not Shakespeare's) metaphysical wheel of fire.

New Contributors to This Issue

Charlotte Endymion Porter, a member of the Board of Directors of the Association and from the beginning a loyal active supporter of the organization, has long been known as a devoted student of Shakespeare. She has been an ardent champion of the First Folio, for a most convenient edition of which she is responsible. Both in her writing and lecturing she has always brought enthusiasm and learning to the interpretation of Shakespeare and of the Elizabethan stage.

Robert Weston Babcock, editor of publications and assistant professor of English at Purdue University, is reticent about his scholarly achievements. But his illuminating article speaks for itself.

Karl J. Holzknecht, assistant professor of English at New York University, has won a reputation for searching scholarly criticism in the English drama.

Some Emendations of Shakspere's Text

By Samuel A. Tannenbaum

UNDOUBTEDLY there are passages in Shakspere which editors now accept without question as representing what the poet wrote but which are, nevertheless, not what he wrote. These passages may be divided into two classes: (a) those which, obscure or impossible in the original, have been "successfully" emended; and (b) those which make apparently good sense and have never been questioned, or, if questioned, have not been emended by conservative scholars.

In *Macbeth* (II. i, 68—ed. Furness) we have an excellent example of the former. Macbeth, having recovered from his hallucination, says: "and wither'd Murther, / . . . thus with his stealthy pace,/ With *Tarquins* rauishing sides, towards his designe/ Moues like a Ghost." All but two or three editors accept Pope's substitution of "strides" for the Folio's "sides." The few editors who retain "sides" interpret the word as a verb meaning "matches"; those who adopt "strides" say that the word (as used in Shakspere's day) was not inconsistent with "stealthy pace." But no one has explained how the compositor came to set up "sides" if the manuscript read "strides." Dr. Johnson rightly objected to "strides," but unfortunately his suggestion to substitute "slides" (as a verb) was so unhappy that it prejudiced editors against everything he had to say on the subject. And yet "slides" (meaning "glides" and used substantively) is much more likely to give us Shakspere's word. The image which Shakspere had in mind is expressed exactly in Milton's words: "Smooth sliding without step." For "slide" in the sense of "glide" see Skeat's *Etymological Dictionary.*

In Elizabethan ("secretary") script initial *str* does not resemble *s;* "strides" is therefore not likely to have been misread "sides." But initial *sl,* written as a digraph and carelessly, without a loop between the *s* and the *l,* would almost certainly be mistaken for *s.* "Strides" and the movements of a "ghost" seem to me incompatible; "slides," on the contrary, is just the right word, as is proved by the following definition of the verb in the *New English Dictionary:* "to proceed unperceived, quietly or stealthily; to steal, creep, slink or slip *away, into or out of* a place." Professor Mark H. Liddell, it may be noted, reads "slides" (in *The Elizabethan Shakspere,* 1903, p. 61), regarding "sides" as a misprint resulting from a "foul" case, the compositor having picked up an *s* instead of an *sl* duotype. He also shows that the word

"slide" "was applied to the creeping of a serpent or to the approach of a thief." There are, then, four good reasons for reading "slides," none for reading "strides."

In *The Merchant of Venice* there is a passage the correctness of which has never been questioned but which, nevertheless, seems to the present writer to be wrong. Solanio, in the first scene of the play, expresses the conviction that Antonio "Is sad to thinke vpon his merchandize." Antonio, declining to accept this interpretation of his melancholy, says:

> "Beleeue me no, I thanke my fortune for it,
> My ventures are not in one bottome trusted,
> Nor to one place; nor is my whole estate
> Upon the fortune of this present yeere:
> Therefore my merchandize makes me not sad." (I. i, 46-50)

In line 49 the word "yeere" is, it seems to me, inappropriate. Under the circumstances detailed in scene 1, Antonio would not be likely to say that his fortune ("estate") is not dependent on what the current "year" will bring. Salarino and Solanio evidently have in mind some notable venture of Antonio's; that is why they speak of "Peering in Maps for ports, and peers, and rodes" and of the "harme a winde too great might doe at sea." Shylock has the same thing in mind when he points out that Antonio's "means are in supposition." Shakspere would not have dwelt on the subject of Antonio's argosies so much if he had not wished us to feel that this had an important bearing on the coming action. The repeated emphasis on the hazards surrounding Antonio's present venture is the poet's way of preparing us for the royal merchant's insolvency. Near the end of the scene Antonio admits to Bassanio that "all [his] fortunes are at sea." It is evident, therefore, that Antonio's remark to his loquacious and parasitic friends cannot have reference to the business he expects to do during the year; he intends, not quite honestly, to convey the impression that his present ventures are not of such tremendous importance as they think them. But we know that his "whole estate" *did* depend on the safe return of the ships which were now scattered on the ocean. What Shakspere intended Antonio to say is, therefore, this:

> "nor is my whole estate
> Vpon the fortune of this present *geere.*"

In the word "gear"—which the *New English Dictionary* defines as "a matter, affair, business"—there is just that touch of depreciation which the passage as a whole requires.

"Geere," written with a minuscular *g,* could have been easily misread "yeere" by the compositor. It is of interest in this connection to note that the modern editors of the manuscript of *The Marriage of Wit and Wisdom* made the opposite mistake and read "geare" instead of "yeare."[1]

A passage in *Macbeth* which seems to have been accepted without question by any preceding commentator but which the present writer regards as unquestionably corrupt occurs at the end of the first scene in the second act. The harrowed Macbeth, having partially recovered his self-possession—at any rate, sufficiently to go on with the murder of the gracious Duncan—prays to the sure and firm-set earth not to hear his steps for fear the very stones shall prate of what he is about and take the present horror from the time. At this terrible moment he hears the bell, the signal from his fiendish Lady that she has laid the daggers where he cannot miss them and that all has been prepared for the slaughter. Gathering his shattered nerves together as well as he can, the cowardly assassin says:

"the Bell inuites me.
Heare it not, *Duncan,* for it is a Knell,
That summons thee to Heauen, or to Hell."

Even in my boyhood, as often as I read *Macbeth,* the last line of this speech seemed to me highly objectionable, as well from a poetic as from a dramatic and psychological viewpoint. Today I would unhesitatingly brand it, as it stands, as the worst line in all of Shakspere's works. For the conscience-stricken Macbeth, who prays that his victim may not hear the fatal knell, to say that Duncan's soul will go either to heaven or to hell is too preposterously banal for Shakspere. Macbeth might just as inartistically, or perhaps more artistically, have said "And I shall do this job or ill or well." Moreover, Macbeth's last line is too tame dramatically for an exit speech. No wonder that some actors recited that final couplet with a "bellowing declamation" (see Furness); they deserve nothing better.

However, the main objection to the line is psychological. After the exhibition of Macbeth's agony at the prospect of murdering his king, his benefactor, his guest, him who had "borne his faculties so meek . . . that his virtues will plead, like angels, trumpet-tongued, against the deep damnation

[1] See the present writer's "Comments on *The Marriage of Wit and Wisdom,*" in *Philological Quarterly,* IX, 321-340, esp. pages 331, 334 and 335.

of his taking off," we cannot think it possible that it would occur to this highly sensitive assassin that his innocent victim would go to hell.

To remedy the objectionable verse, to convert bathos into poetry, to transform platitude into a profoundly psychological utterance, and to give the actor a chance for good acting (with a significant exit), we need only change the word "or" to "me" ("thee to heaven, me to hell").

But, it may be asked, could the compositor have set up "or" if the poet's manuscript (or a transcript thereof) read "me"? The answer is yes. We may recall that in *Twelfth Night* (III. iii, 9—"As might haue drawne one to a longer voyage") a number of fine scholars have substituted, or approved of substituting, "me" for "one" (see Furness *Variorum,* p. 211). In *The Merry Wives of Windsor,* III. v, 138 ("if I have horns to make one mad"), Dyce[1] regarded "one" as an "obvious error" for "me" and took the occasion to point out that "The word 'one' is frequently printed by mistake for 'me'." If "one" (then often written "on") could be misread as "me," there is no reason why "or" (which is easily mistaken for "on") could not be so misread. How this could happen is beautifully shown by the manuscript of *The Marriage of Wit and Wisdom* (1570). Halliwell, editing that manuscript for the Shakespeare Society in 1846, made the mistake (in which he was followed by Farmer in 1908) of reading the manuscript's "one" as "me," clearly proving that these words can be mistaken one for the other;[2] in another passage he misread "me" as "and"—because "the scribe's initial *m,* looked at carelessly, often looks like *on* or *an.*"[3] If Shakspere or the transcriber of *Macbeth* was in the habit of terminating words with an upward and backward curl, as we know Shakspere was (see his signatures), the compositor could easily have misread "me" for "ore" and set it up as "or." Only rarely did compositors follow their authors' orthography.

In *The Merchant of Venice* (II. i, 36-40- ed. Furness) the Prince of

[1] *Remarks on Mr. J. P. Collier's and Mr. Knight's Editions of Shakespeare,* 1844, p. 16.

[2] See my essay, previously cited, p. 327.

[3] Id.

Morocco complains that by the fickleness of fortune Alcides may be beaten by his "rage" (the reading of the Quartos and the Folios). Theobald corrected "rage" to "page" by "cutting off the Tail of a single Letter," and has been followed—rightly—by all editors but Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch and Dr. J. Dover Wilson. These editors (in the *"new" Cambridge Shakespeare,* 1926) reject "page" and read (in their text, not merely in their notes) "wag"—on the following grounds: "rag" (which does not occur in the original text) was an old-fashioned spelling of "rage" in Shakspere's day; Theobald's emendation is "unfortunately impossible palaeographically, *p* and *r* being quite unlike in English script"; changing "wag" into "rag" would be only "a minim-misprint"; "wag" "gives the same sense" as "page." But our "new" editors are wrong as to all but the first of their four points. Theobald's emendation is palaeographically perfect; some Elizabethan penmen made "secretary" *p*'s which are indistinguishable from a certain variety of *r* (see my book, *The Handwriting of the Renaissance,* Columbia University Press, 1930, cuts on pages 61 and 66, noting especially the ninth *p* on the first line of the former and the fourth *r* on the fifth line of the latter). And, furthermore, "wag" does not give the same sense as "page". Hercules was not distinguished for humor; there would therefore be no point in his being outwitted by his "wag." Besides, Lichas was not a wag. Nor would "rag" for "wag" be "a minim-misprint," even though a *w* might be mistaken for an *r* or the compositor might, because of a "foul" case, have set up "rag" instead of "wag."

In *Measure for Measure* (I. iii, 20) the Duke speaks of Vienna's strict statutes as the "needful bits and curbs to headstrong weedes." Most editors adopt Theobald's "steeds" for the Folio's "weedes"; but the *"new Cambridge"* editors prefer Walker's "wills" because (they say) it "makes better sense and at least begins with a *w.*" The use of the word "bits" shows that Shakspere had horses in mind; in old English ("secretary") script, as written by some persons, it would be extremely easy to mistake *st* for *w,* but "wills" could not be misread "weedes."

Isabella, hearing of her brother's arrest, exclaims (*Measure,* I. iv, 45) "Some one with child by him? My cousin Juliet?" The second question-mark is certainly wrong. Knowing of her brother's betrothal, Isabella must have immediately sensed that it was Juliet; the text requires a period, or, even better (as a token of sympathy for the "cousin"), an exclamation mark.

Isabella's remark (I. iv, 50—"O, let him marry her.") seems so flippant and so sophisticated, that it cannot be what Shakspere intended. We must read "Oh!—Let him marry her!" The "Oh" would be interpreted by an actress or a good reader as an expression of great distress; "let him marry her!" would then represent a sudden inspiration.

Angelo, in the same play (II. iv, 79), makes the observation that "these black masks/ Proclaim an enshield [*i.e.,* shielded, concealed] beauty ten times louder/ Than beauty could displayed." The generalizing character of the remark requires "those" instead of "these."

"I have hope to live," says Claudio (*Measure,* III, i, 4), "and am prepar'd to die." The Folio prints an apostrophe between "I" and "have," to indicate that Shakspere intended Claudio to say "I've." The *"new Cambridge"* editors, however, retain "I'have" because the *New English Dictionary* "quotes no example of mod. contracted form before eighteenth century." But "I've" occurs in Middleton's *The Widow* (ed. Bullen, II. ii, 117 and 172); it occurs also in his *A Game at Chesse* (ed. R. C. Bald, II. ii, 43), and elsewhere

"Thou art too noble to conserve a life/ In base appliances" (*Measure,* III. i, 88). Read "appliance." Many passages in this play show that Shakspere's final *e* was easily mistaken for his final *es* flourish.

When Isabella (*Measure,* III. i, 93) is preparing to tell her doomed brother of the wickedness of the "outward-sainted deputy," Claudio exclaims, "The prenzie Angelo?". Many emendations have been proposed for the impossible "prenzie" both here and in line 96. Most editors accept Hanmer's substitution of "priestly" for "prenzie," though no one has explained how the error arose. It seems fairly clear that in line 93 "prenzie" is a misreading of "queazie" (*i.e.,* "queasy," meaning "squeamish," "overnice," "fastidious," "goody-good," "mawkishly good") the *q* having been mistaken for *p,* the *u* for *r,* and the open *a* for *n.*

How it happens that the meaningless word "prenzie" occurs again in line 96 may perhaps be explained as follows: Shakspere originally wrote "priestly" (assuming that that is the correct word in line 96) in both places; subsequently he decided to change the word in line 93 to "queasy"; turning to his manuscript, his eye first caught the "priestly" in line 96, which he deleted, writing "queazie" over it; then, realizing the mistake he had made, he made the same correction in line 93, but forgot to re-correct line 96 or made the correction in such a way that the compositor was misled.

A Neglected Shakspere Document

By Samuel A. Tannenbaum

IN THE discussion of the fortunes of John Shakspere during the period preceding William's departure from Stratford, no biographer of the poet, not even Sir Edmund K. Chambers (in his recently published 'encyclopedia'), has a word to say about a certain very interesting document. This document, of a strictly legal nature, was discovered by James O. Halliwell-Phillipps, is mentioned in one of his books, is preserved in the Public Record Office at London, and seems never to have been published or discussed. And yet it is a document of considerable importance. In the first place, it characterizes John Shakspere as a "glover," not a butcher or a dealer in wool; in the second place, it allows the inference that the poet's father was not financially embarrassed during what is generally considered to have been the darkest period in his economic affairs.

The document is what is legally known as a bail-bond, and sets forth the facts that John Shakspere, glover, and Thomas Jones, coppersmith, gave bail at Coventry, on July 19,1587, in the sum of ten pounds each, for the due appearance of one Michael Pryce of Stratford who had been indicted for a felony. This neglected document reads as follows:

Controlment Roll (King's Bench, Crown Side), 29 Elizabeth. Michaelmas Term. Roll 44.

Civitas Coventr' ss'

Memorand' q'd Joh'es Newporte gen^ros' C'ticus pacis Civitatis. p^rd' die Sab'ti p'x'post Octab' Sc'i Mich'is isto eodem t^rmi'o p' manus suas p'pr' delib'avit his in Cur' quandam recogn' de recordo t^rminand' &c' que sequit^r s's Memorand' q'd decimo nono die Julii anno regni d'ne n're Elizabeth' Dei gr' a Angl' Franc' & Hib'nie regine fidei defensoris &c' octavo coram Thoma Wight uno Justic' d'ce d'ne regime ad pacem in Civitat' & Com' p^rd' Cons'vand' necnon ad div'sa felon' t'ansgr' & al' malefact' in Civitat' & Com' p^rd' p'petrat' audiend' & t^rmi'and' assign' vener' Michaell Pryce de Stratford sup' Avon' in Com' Warr' Tinker Joh'es Shakspere de esdem villa & Com' glover & Thomas Jones de eisdem villa & Com' copp'smythe p'sonalit^r constitut' recognover' se debere d'ce d'ne rgin scil't p^rd'cus Michaell Pryce vigint' libr' & p^rd'ci Joh'es Shakespere & Thomas Jones ut^rq' eor' decem libr' de t^rr' & ten't' bonis & Catallis suis ad opus d'ce d'ne regine levand' sub condyc'one sequen' The condyc'on of this recognizaunce is suche that yf thabove-bounden Michaell Pryce do p'sonallye appeare before her Ma^ties in her Benche the fourthe

day of Michaellmas tearme nowe next ensuinge the date hereof and doe then and there recorde his appearaunce and doe not dep'te thence withoute the lycence of the Justices of that Courte untyll he shall have there answered the byll of indytement of felony wherein the sayd Michall standeth indyted that then this recognizaunce shalbe voyde and of none effecte or els shall stande & be in full strenght & vertue &c'.
Forisfact' & extract' in S'cc'm Trin' xxix° E. R^e.[1]

John Shakspere must have satisfied the authorities that he was worth not less than ten pounds in lands, goods, and chattels, else he would not have been accepted as bailor. It is evident that he was not the poor broken bankrupt of the biographers who love to picture him as a "skulking debtor" and to dwell pityingly on his evasions of the sheriff and on his failure to attend church on Sundays because of fear of arrest for debt.

[1] The above transcript was made for the present writer on November 15, 1904, by Mr. S. S. Handcock, Assistant Keeper of the Public Records.

Shakespeare[1]

By Henry Hanby Hay

Out of the dark he came, our Island pearl,
And maiden fancy kissed her peasant churl.
From stately Thames to Mississippi's rage
Two nations claim him as their heritage.
Hardened by labor, hymned by ever-youth,
Marshalled by justice, firmly led by truth,
Warmed in the bosom of humanity,
Was Shakespeare born for time, for you and me.

Never was heart more human, shafts more bold,
Again and yet again he pierced the gold;
Poets had sung and marched in conquest's van,
He chanted Kings and eke the common man.
He showed the bards there was no vulgar way,
And wrote in crystal what they wrote in clay.
The oak departs! Forgot may Homer lie!
When the sun wanes, then Shakespeare's fame shall die.

[1] Reprinted, with the author's permission, from his play *As Shakespeare Was*, Douglas, 1931.

How Shakespeare Made Trees Act[1]

(In *Henry VI, Titus Andronicus,* and *Love's Labour's Lost*)

By Charlotte Endymion Porter

A GARDEN is little apt to be thought of today, I suppose, as an appurtenance to a Theatre. Still less so as a scenic asset useful and close at hand to be drawn upon vividly for its native loveliness. Yet it was rendered not so very difficult for Elizabeth at Court and for Shakespeare both there and in his Public Playhouse. That it was easy enough toward the middle of his career is made evident by the Inventory item unearthed by Professor Wallace and published in *The Times* May 1, 1914. With the undebatable positiveness of a legal Latin record for the King's or Queen's Bench it lets us know of the landed property on which the Globe was put up and effected at the date of entry, May 16, 1599,—a last entry and at somewhat later date than the other entries of May 12 of the Brend Estate then passing to the heir, Nicholas Brend, and the Globe Site, from him on lease for 31 years into Shakespeare's hands and to him only by name. It lists "the Playhouse—(*Duomo*) newly built with the garden belonging to the same—(*cum gardino eidem pertinenti*), in the parish of St. Saviour aforesaid and the county of Surry aforesaid, now in the occupation of William Shakespeare and others (*et aliorum*)." Neither Cuthbert Burbage who was the owner of an expired lease his landlord would not renew, nor his brother Richard the actor and owner of the leased Blackfriars, appear to be as dominant in the deed of the Brend attorney and the Commissioners taking in charge this inventory, as the "Burbages" are made by any writers I have seen who relate the circumstances. And except, of course, in the case of the sedulously faithful Scholar, Sir E. K. Chambers, those who cite this Brend item of the lease seem to squirm at the phrase "with the garden belonging to the same." At any rate, they omit it. But since I am talking of Gardens as appurtenances to scenic effects on the Base Stage I do not dot it out with little dots.

It is in keeping with what I am to speak of that in his novice Plays, the trilogy of *Henry VI,* his tragedy of *Titus,* and the crown of his early Comedies, he enlists trees in the action. The Histories appear by Henslowe's entries as put on at the Rose; and at the same early date in 1592 there, his first playgoers give printed comment on witnessing them before August 8 and September 3

[1] Here and always I cite Shakespeare from original texts, Folio or Quarto, as in my 40 Vol. Edition of Shakespeare's Plays and Poems. This artice was first delivered as a lecture at Wells College, November, 1926. Copyright by the author, 1931.

of that same year by specifying The First and Third parts respectively of the Trilogy. At the Rose we happen to know there was a Garden. And of that it is strikingly obvious that he did make a Scenic effect by means of it in the opening of the First Part—an effect moreover which prefigures the historic tragedy to follow in the other parts of the Wars of York and Lancaster. How strangely modern a stylistic prefigurement it is of what's to come before the emblems of the Red and White Roses on either side blend their struggles, after the Sequel of the downfall of Richard III. in that History, with the triumphant accession of the Tudors! And how it reaches on, with more meaning for the omission of direct reference to Elizabeth, the Golden Rose, thus made emblematic of the event in her own person.

Shakespeare's first Playgoer who has left any testimony, identifies the Opening History as 1 *Henry VI.,* by citing it with relation to its hero: "*Talbot* (*the terror of the French*"). It is the epithet repeated from French mouths by Talbot himself, and he is the hero of no other Play we know. The actor who had the strong man's part to render, must do it in an agony so galling (I. iv. 47) that we must perforce understand how here and in the rending scenes of Talbot with his son (IV. iv-vii.) the passion of it might unfailingly draw the tears, as Nashe says it did, of "ten thousand spectators at least (at several times)." A throng indeed for that small house, named the Rose from the roses long persistently growing there. (*Pierce Penilesse* . . Written by Thomas Nash, Gentleman . . Imprinted . . 1592. McKerrow's edition, I, 211.)

The "littell Roos" had "two Gardyns." Thomasyn Symonds speaks thus endearingly of her home as she bequeathed house and rose-gardens to her parish in Southwark. The Trustees in charge of her bequest made their property over to Henslowe, March 4, 1564-5, assigning the remainder of its lease expiring 1605. His business arrangements followed for building a playhouse there. He speaks of it in his diary as in Framing . . shortly to "be ereckted and sette uppe on a piece of its grounde or garden plotte." It was ready in 1587 and waiting for some years, predestined, it appears, to bring out a certain scene effectively by means of Thomasyn's Rose-trees, when Henslowe writes of beginning "the 19 of Febreary my lord Strange's mene as followeth". On March 3, 1591, following in the motley list of plays set thereunder, appears "Harey the Vj" with "ne" prefixed, supposed to be Henslowe's mark of a new play. Notable in taking in 3 pounds 16 shillings 8 pence then and keeping up the not common pounds entry, then dwindling, "harey" was repeated for 15 entries

from March on during 1592 until June 20, without sign from Henslowe of the three parts. But what of what? Where he fails to grasp that the new Play was *I Henry VI.,* Nashe had promptly identified it as that. And 3 *Henry VI.* is not only identified as being at least one of Henslowe's vague "hareys" by the striking line from it (I. iv. 147) parodied by Greene in his *Groatsworth of Wit,* posthumously printed that September but also in his envious allusion meant to slur Shakespeare. Greene really identifies him as known by him and all London, then, to be its author.

If ever a garden made appertinent to a theatre and suggestive for its scenic action deserved itself, as a garden, to be called famous, I think it was Thomasyn's, which thus made Shakespeare first famous in London.

Sir Philip Sidney first caught the lovely look of those roses. His friend Sir Edmund Dyer lived within view of them, it is said. Being often there with him, Sidney was moved to bring it in to his Romance (*Arcadia,* Feuillerat's edition, p. 119), as "a place of Roses, all the rest flourishing green, the roses adding such a ruddy glow to it as though the field were bashful at its own beauty" and as if "made to enclose a theatre grew such roses."

Did not Shakespeare read *Arcadia?* All London did. Then Shakespeare's inwardly-burning ruminative eyes brooded over them. And as mind and hand went together, did he not find the place made to show forth a scene able to enact with grace the suggestion they gave him to sweeten his bitter plot, long and bloody, lying ahead of him to chronicle, with some simulacrum of symbolic beauty and peace of growth, also ahead?

"Within the Temple Hall we were too lowd" (begins Suffolk)
The Garden here is more convenient."

Shakespeare brings the group as to quiet their wrangling to the scenic rose-trees.

"Let him that is a trueborne gentleman" (shouts Yorke)
"From off this Bryer pluck a white Rose with me."

Somerset rejoins,

"Let him that is no Coward, nor no Flatterer,
But dare maintain the partie of the truth,
Pluck a red Rose from off this Thorne with me."

Overbearing Warwick beats him back with sneering puns:

"I love no Colours: and without all colour
Of base insinuating Flatterite,
I pluck this White Rose with Plantagenet."

Stubborn Suffolk joins issue sharply:

"I pluck this Red Rose, with young Somerset,
And, say withall, I thinks he held the Righte."

"Stay, Lords and Gentlemen!" puts in Vernon, to give a wily turn to the talk that may be useful,

"Pluck no more
Till you conclude, that he upon his side
The fewest Roses are, from the Tree cropt
Shall yeeld the other in the right opinion."

Somerset takes the dare,

"If I have fewest, I subscribe in silence."

"And I," says Vernon, and his ruse now triumphing, reveals himself.

"Then for the truth, and plainesse of the Case,
I pluck this pale and Maiden Blossome here,
Giving my Verdict on the white Rose side."

Yorke crows at that,—"Now Somerset, where is your argument?" In a flash back comes this from Somerset:—

"Here is my scabbord, meditating that
Shall dye your white Rose—red."

Then each retorts,—"Hath not thy Rose a canker, Somerset?" and "Hath not thy Rose a Thorne, Plantagenet?"

Swords and taunts are out together now turning these wearers of roses into insulting wranglers. So, even with roses, hot and hotter our playmaker whets their ire and iron, until Warwick sums up with the prophecy—

"—this brawle today
Grown to this faction in the Temple Garden
Shall send between the Red-Rose and the White,
A thousand Soules to Death and deadly Night."

The Garden was at hand to equip all the rest of the trilogy by levies on it: *e.g.*, for Yorke's "close Walke along by the Wall." Over the Wall in the second play (iv, x.) Jack Cade tumbles to the ground at the same moment Iden

enters opposite, according to the stage directions and business of the Quarto. Iden enters philosophising on gardens and "quiet Walkes" while the famished Cade is lying "downe picking of hearbes and eating them." Presently Iden's Sword finds the poor fellow's belly. Finally in the third part (III. vi) the "thicke growne brake" is both the needed and decorative effect to make a "covert" from which the two actors—in their own names, Sincklo & Humfrey —"with crosse-bowes in their handes," hiding to watch the King, come out to waylay him.

Most abhorrent, in contrast to these examples, yet in the range of Shakespeare's gift for making the action of the play scenic by means of trees planted on the base-Stage, is his next novice stroke at it, also at the Rose, in *Titus Andronicus*. What does he devise there in the way of a "stylized" tree to signify and mark a villainy but the Elder tree?—The very kind of a tree which the lore of folk and the text has appropriated for hanging Judas!

That accursed scoundrel, Aaron, is introduced "alone," with this tree for interlocutor to do a deed of dreadful note. In this scene at the root of this tree he digs the "sutile hole." A snare, indeed, he means that pit to be. Here at the Rose in 1594, the base stage had a roomy trap. We are to see it work. The bodies that were tumbled into that trap seem to demonstrate its roominess.

The whole conception is anything but lovely. Yet in a certain artistic sense and by a slang use of the word, it is "lovely"—the effective way in which our novice manages to make suit the case either his fair roses or his hot horrors for his London audiences. The long-laid plan of the evil mind delighting in wickedness fixes our eyes upon Aaron. Passing over his unspeakable villainy, we see the tree threaten to revenge itself at the close of the Tragedy. It will be used as the gallows for Aaron's infant child.

Out of such might in wrong Shakespeare's 'prentice hand was made capable of Iago.

A thoroughly happy instance of his scenic faculty for making trees play necessary parts with his other actors arrives in one of the early comedies. That one is long known to have been played before the great Gloriana. The peak of *Love's Labour's Lost* assuredly is the eaves-dropping episode, where one by one each courtier-student inadvertently betrays himself to his predecessor on

the scene but unseen by each newcomer except the one first arriving. How much in love each one is! How eager to break his vow! how ready to unmask the hypocrisy of the one who followed and keep his own hidden! All that scene and play of amusing action depends upon the convenient eaves-dropping places afforded each, by the "bushes" and the "coppice edges," to hide from one another but not from the audience. Nor from Berowne.

Finally the climax depends upon "the sycamore tree." It is stout enough for Berowne to climb into. The original Folio stage directions made this clever stage action clear. "He stands aside." "The King stands aside," and so on. But Berowne's own words, as they all have hidden by stepping behind such nooks of vantage, go to show the position he is forced to take at last if not at first, quite apart to make the climax conspicuous. I suspect his first "stand aside" may take him to a hiding-nook he has been forced to surrender suddenly to the need of each last preceding eaves-dropper. Anticipating each, he is at last quick enough to prevent discovery there by himself by scrambling up the broad trunk of tree he has been actively lurking behind. At this juncture he himself says of this Puss-in-a-corner play of infants, as he calls it, what indisputably shows him to be then up a tree.

"All hid, all hid, an old infant play,
Like a demie god, here sit I in the skie,
And wretched fooles secrets heedfully ore eye."

Imagine the laughter of the Queen and her group of ladies!

This is true of the original text. "Advancing" has been interpolated by Editors.

Some Recent Book Titles from Shakespeare

By K. J. Holzknecht

Life's Fitful Fever,—Margaret Nevinson.

"After life's fitful fever he sleeps well."
—*Macbeth,* III, ii.

To-morrow and To-morrow,—Philip Barry.

"To-morrow and to-morrow and to-morrow,
Creeps in his petty pace from day to day."
—*Macbeth,* V, v.

All Our Yesterdays,—H. M. Tomlinson.

"And all our yesterdays have lighted fools
The way to dusty death."
—*Macbeth,* V, v.

Brief Candles,—Aldous Huxley.

"Out, out, brief candle!"
—*Macbeth,* V, v.

This Poor Player,—Shirley Watkins.
Their Hour Upon the Stage,—James Agate.
Hour Upon the Stage,—A. Pinchot.

"Life's but a walking shadow, a poor player
That struts and frets his hour upon the stage
And then is heard no more."
—*Macbeth,* V, v.

The Weird Sisters,—J. Blyth.

"The Weird sisters, hand in hand,
Posters of the sea and land."
—*Macbeth,* I, iii.

The Ravelled Sleeve,—Betty Inskio.

"Sleep that knits up the ravell'd sleave of care."
—*Macbeth,* II, ii.

Look to the Lady,—Margery Allingham.

"Help me hence, ho!—Look to the Lady."
—*Macbeh,* II, iii.

And Such Small Deer,—E. V. Lucas.

"Mice and rats, and such small deer."
—*King Lear,* III, iv.

The Night's Candles,—Réne Roy.

"Night's Candles are burnt out and jocund day
Stands tiptoe on the misty mountain tops."
—*Romeo and Juliet,* III, v.

Give Me My Sin Again,—Naomi G. Royde-Smith.

"Sin from my lips? O trespass sweetly urged!
Give me my sin again."

—*Romeo and Juliet,* I, v.

Who is Sylvia?—Kathlyn Rhodes.

"Who is Sylvia? What is she,
That all our swains commend her?"

—*Two Gentlemen of Verona,* IV, ii.

This Other Eden,—E. V. Knox.

"This other Eden, demi paradise."

—*Richard II,* II, i.

Trip No Further,—Jane Lindsay.

"Trip No Further, pretty sweeting,
Journeys end in lovers meeting."

—*Twelfth Night,* II, iii.

Cakes and Ale,—W. E. Maugham.

"Dost thou think, because thou art virtuous, there shall be no more cakes and ale?"

—*Twelfth Night,* II, iii.

Merely Players,—Claude Bragdon.

"All the world's a stage,
And all the men and women merely players."

—*As You Like It,* II, vii.

Unwillingly to School,—Anne Allardice.

"Then the whining school-boy, with his satchel
And shining morning face, creeping, like snail,
Unwillingly to school."

—*As You Like it,* II, vii.

Then a Soldier,—George Braham.

"Then a soldier,
Full of strange oaths, and bearded like a pard."

—*As You Like it,* II, vii.

But Not for Love,—Beatrice Kean Seymour.

"Men have died from time to time and worms have eaten them, but not for love."

—*As You Like It,* IV, i.

Full Fathom Five: A Book of Famous Shipwrecks,—Frank H. Shaw.

Full Fathom Five,—George G. Foster.

"Full fathom five thy father lies
Of his bones are coral made."

—*Tempest,* I, iii.

Where the Bee Sucks: A Book of Flowers,—(ed.) Iola Williams.

"Where the bee sucks
There suck I."

—*Tempest,* V, i.

Speak the Speech,—Barrett H. Clark.

"Speak the speech, I pray you, as I pronounced it to you."

—*Hamlet,* III, ii.

No Traveller Returns,—Jane England.

"The undiscovered country from whose bourne
No traveller returns."

—*Hamlet,* III, i.

Green Girl,—Priscilla Johnston.

"You speak like a green girl."

—*Hamlet,* I, iii.

Salad Days,—Theodora Benson.

"My salad days, when I was green in judgement."

—*Anthony and Cleopatra,* I, v.

No Goodness in the Worm,—Gay Taylor.

"There is no goodness in the worm."

—*Anthony and Cleopatra,* V, ii.

As the Gentle Rain,—Isabel C. Clarke.

"The quality of mercy is not strained,
It droppeth, as the gentle rain, from heaven."

—*Merchant of Venice,* IV, i.

Sigh No More Ladies,—Ingaret Gifford.

"Sigh no more, ladies, sigh no more,
Men were deceivers ever."

—*Much Ado About Nothing,* II, iii.

The Evil that Men do,—E. Leadbitter.

"The evil that men do lives after them;
The good is oft interred with their bones."

—*Julius Caesar,* III, ii.

There is a Tide,—Agnes Logan.

Taken at the Flood,—Dorothy Lambert.

"There is a tide in the affairs of men,
Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune."

—*Julius Caesar,* IV, iii.

The Annual Dinner

IF ANY specific locality can be, like Boston, "a state of mind," then surely the 143 members and guests assembled under the American and British flags held in place by the Shakespeare shield, passed through the "Ivory Door" into Shakespeare-land for the annual dinner at the National Arts Club, Sunday evening, May 3d. As one of the out-of-town members writes:

"When I stepped into the National Arts Club I felt myself back in England. My memory is stored with colorful words and kindly wit and that indefinable something that makes one feel at home among strangers — a gracious kindliness, I call it."

One always feels that "difference" in entering the Arts Club, but what made a special atmosphere on this occasion was the remarkably interesting exhibition gathered and arranged as a feature of the Centenary celebration of Gramercy Park, the only private park in New York City, and with an interesting history. A hundred years does not take us back to Shakespeare, but it does give a sort of "settled" feeling—a feeling of established order, and the exhibition of portraits, letters and documents, costumes, etc., created the illusion of an old-world environment.

The tables with golden candlesticks with tall tapers, and golden vases and bowls filled with the Spring flowers—yellow, and purple iris, daffodils, snapdragons, and early roses, harmonizing with the wall exhibits, made a lovely ensemble, the beauty of which was enhanced by the good-looking Shakespeareans in colorful evening dress. Several members from out of town were present, including a table of ten members of the Avon Bard Club of New Rochelle, and four members of the West Philadelphia Shakespeare Club II. Unfortunately several reservations had to be rejected because they came too late.

The dinner itself, in the matter of food and service was a satisfaction which put every one in a happy frame of mind.

After coffee, and the removal of all the tables in the Tilden gallery, except the guest table and others along the East wall, President Thorndike, in welcoming the members and guests, restated the aims and objects of the Association and told of its steady though slow progress. The Secretary stated that as the annual reports of the officers and standing committees will be printed in the July *Bulletin,* the only "business" to be reported at the dinner was the unanimous election of the five Directors of the Class of 1934 whose names had been presented by the Nominating Committee, viz.: George W. Davison, John H. H. Lyon, Miss Caroline B. Parker, Miss Charlotte E. Porter and Dr. A. S. W. Rosenbach. Then, mentioning the receipt of several messages of regret, the secretary read the very cordial and sincere letter of Cornelia Otis Skinner, explaining that an important

business matter unexpectedly called her out of town from Friday to Tuesday, and asking if she might come next year. Miss Edith Barrett, too, was kept indoors by an annoying cold, but the others of the "all-star Shakespeare cast" were in attendance. The Association owes thanks not only to the Chairman of the dinner, Prof. Lyon, for arranging such an attractive programme, but to the participants for keeping an engagement requiring so much effort. Mr. and Mrs. Leiber drove forty miles from their New Jersey home—and forty miles back; Miss Matthison and Mr. Kennedy came into town from some twenty-five miles up the Hudson; Mr. Hampden, who was booked in two widely separated cities Saturday and Monday evenings, made a special effort to be at the dinner, and Dr. Neilson deferred his return to Northampton in order to be present. They were all kind enough to say that the "law of compensation" operated successfully.

Fritz Leiber, being asked to speak on the Civic Theatre, spoke briefly of his own varied experience and told about the present culmination in the Civic Theatre of Chicago, made possible through the energy of a man who is interested in the educational, cultural value of Shakespearean productions. Mrs. Leiber joined her husband and they gave the murder and mad scenes from *Macbeth,* conveying without scenery, costumes or other accessories, the thrill of horror the lines themselves produce.

Miss Rosalie Miller, who has sung with the Philharmonic and at the Metropolitan, sang two songs from Shakespeare and was followed by Edith Wynne Matthison, who gave the delightful scenes from *As You Like It,* where Rosalind finds the verses Orlando has pinned to the trees, and then promises to teach him how to woo and win Rosalind.

Walter Hampden, from his apparently limitless store of those personal experiences always so delightful to an actor's audience, slipped easily and naturally into his well-known rendering of *Hamlet's* soliloquies.

Miss Miller, who again received hearty applause for her two numbers, was followed by Charles Rann Kennedy, whose rich experience as actor and playwright on both sides of the water make him an always interesting speaker.

Dr. Neilson in a very brief but witty speech explained why he could not speak longer.

Then President Thorndike thanked all who had contributed to the success of the evening, not forgetting to thank the Arts Club for its continued hospitality, and adjourned the meeting to next year. M. B. M.

Annual Report of the Secretary

OBVIOUSLY a secretary's annual reports from year to year must be of similar nature, as the chief difference in the work outside of routine lies in the individuality of the correspondence. It is impracticable to report more on this than that its most marked feature is the fact that more and more of our members are coming to feel that this is "our Association," to which they bring their inquiries and problems. It is fortunate for the Secretary that the membership includes persons of such varied attainments that almost any inquiry or problem can be referred to some member who is able and willing to suggest a solution.

Until we have a permanent home—our longed-for Shakespeare Center—our activities must necessarily be largely confined to paper, and in regard to this the increasing respect and demand for the quarterly Bulletin is very gratifying. The average number sent out is about 10,000 a year, which includes not only the current issues but the steady demand for specific numbers, from libraries, and from teachers of English who want to use them in their class rooms. And, of course, the Bulletin is our only propaganda material except the personal work of members among their friends, which might well be increased if given a little extra thought and effort. We might *earn* our Shakespeare Center. A member living in France, taking out a membership for an American friend, wrote: "It seems so little (money) for so much"; and another, suggesting several names, hoped they would "take advantage of your most attractive and reasonable and altogether indispensable Bulletin." Requests for Dr. Tannenbaum's invaluable Bibliography are steady and numerous, and those for Prof. Hardin Craig's article on *Recent Shakespeare Scholarship* practically exhausted the edition; other featured articles are in great demand.

The annual report of Mr. Heine, Chairman of the Membership Committee, gives the statistics of membership, and it is hoped that the members will study his report. It should serve as a stimulus for emulation. We welcome all classes of members, but we need especially more Maintaining ($2) and Sustaining ($5) members, as the larger dues help to cover the deficit caused by the low dues ($1) of the Annual members. It is more than difficult for One Dollar to cover the cost of printing and distributing four Bulletins a year, to say nothing of other expenses for stationery, blanks, printing and

postage, and other necessary incidentals, but President Thorndike is anxious to retain the low annual dues which permit the membership of students and teachers who have many uses for their dollars.

Our foreign membership has increased somewhat, and in addition we have several foreign subscribers to the Bulletin who are not members.

The recorded necrology for the year comprises five names, one of which is known far and wide as that of the collector of the unrivaled Shakespeare library to be housed in the building planned by him and now being constructed in Washington, D. C.—Mr. Henry Clay Folger, who died June 11, 1930.

On May 11, 1930, Miss Martha Conant died, a former Professor of English Literature at Wellesley College, and sister of the late Miss Charlotte Conant of the Walnut Hill School, Natick, Mass., who was one of our first Sustaining Members, and whose letter about the Natick Shakespeare Club was published in our first Bulletin, Vol. I, No. 1.

September 8, 1930, we lost an interested member by the death in Boston of William Caleb Loring, retired Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts. From 1911 to 1928, Judge Loring was President of the American School of Classical studies at Athens, Greece.

September 29, 1930, the sudden and unexpected death of Mrs. Tunis G. Bergen, a leader in civic and charitable work in New York, deprived us of her valued services as Director and Member of the Executive Committee, and especially of her untiring interest as Curator of the beginnings of our Library.

On January 18, 1931, one of our stanchest supporters passed on—Mrs. James Ward Warner, one of the founders of the Shakespeare Club of New York City in 1889, and active in Shakespeare interests during all these years.

The record of other deaths in the membership, if any, has not reached the Secretary.

The Association did not as an organization observe Shakespeare's Birthday this year, but most of our affiliated organizations throughout the country,

and Clubs in which we have individual members, had ceremonies or celebrations, and Mrs. Morris, conductor of our Club Forum, has asked them to report to Miss Parker, Chairman of the Association's Committee on Shakespeare Day. The Shakespeare Club of New York City, nearly every member of which is also a member of the Association, which in 1911 originated the custom of placing a laurel wreath on the Ward statue of Shakespeare in Central Park, this year had a simple ceremony in the pouring rain—"the uncertain glory of an April day"—in which Sir Philip Ben Greet participated.

The reports on Shakespeare Gardens show no abatement of interest, and several of the gardens—the one at Portland, Oregon, for instance—have received much publicity and become objects of municipal pride. It is one way of making people acquainted with Shakespeare. "How far that little candle throws his beams!"

The report of the Nominating Committee was duly received and sent to the membership. Twenty-five votes are necessary for a choice, and on this date, May 1, 174 ballots in favor of the ticket—none opposing—have been cast, thus unanimously electing the five nominees as Directors of the Class of 1934, viz: George W. Davison, John H. H. Lyon, Miss Caroline B. Parker, Miss Charlotte E. Porter and Dr. A. S. W. Rosenbach.

The meetings of the Directors and Executive Committee have handled many questions of interest to the Association, some of which are not yet concluded. President Thorndike expressed the Board's concurring appreciation of the services of Prof. Kaufman as Editor of the Bulletin, also thanking the other officers and committees—all of them busy people—for their devotion to the Association's interests. Dr. Tannenbaum continues to add to our reputation and prestige.

The Secretary emphasizes by reiteration the fact that the friendly spirit of cooperation between the officers, committees and members is still maintained and constitutes the strength of the Association.

"Our hopes and friends are infinite."

MYRA B. MARTIN, *Secretary.*

May 1, 1931

Annual Report of the Treasurer

GENERAL ACCOUNT

Receipts

Balance 5/3/30	$1,361.60
Dues and Bulletin Subscriptions	1,102.87
Life Membership	50.00
Advertisement	50.00
Sale of Bulletins	77.75
	$2,642.2

Disbursements

Secretary's account	$ 250.00	
Treasurer's account	22.60	
Annual Meeting	12.10	
Gerry & Murray	202.00	
Printing	32.05	
Reprints	27.00	
Printing Bulletin	972.50	1,518.25
Balance in General Account		$1,123.97

SPECIAL ACCOUNT

Building Fund			100.00
Bibliography Fund			
Balance 5/3/30		$1,278.92	
Paid:			
Bulletin	$432.50		
Secretary's Account	80.00	512.50	766.42
Total Balance in hand			$1,990.39

GEORGE W. DAVISON,
Treasurer.

April 30, 1931.

Annual Report of the Membership Committee

During the year 135 new names have been added to the roster. Resignations, delinquencies and deaths have made the net gain a small one, so that the total number of members, including 43 libraries, as of May 1, 1931, is 848, as against 829 of May 1, 1930.

The demand for the Bulletin is increasing and 62 subscriptions from Libraries, Universities and individuals have been added. There is some encouragement in knowing that notwithstanding general economic impediments there is at least a gain.

New York retains first place in number of membership but Ohio has passed Massachusetts and is now second, Massachusetts is third, Pennsylvania is fourth, California is fifth and Texas is sixth, closely followed by Maryland, Illinois and New Jersey.

Prof. Lyon, Dr. Tannenbaum, New York, Mrs. Aiken-Smith, California, Mrs. Morris of Ohio, have been particularly active.

The Committee would like to receive from the various state chairmen a report of their activities and to advance such suggestions as would help to stimulate interest in the Association and increase the membership thereof.

The Committee is very eager to have these reports and suggestions for the purpose of formulating a campaign this fall.

The perpetuity and success of the Association depends vitally upon membership, to give us more latitude to operate, as our cramped means at present do not permit.

Attached are the statistics of membership as of May 1, 1931.

ARTHUR HEINE, *Chairman.*

Statistics of Membership, May 1 1931

	Annual	*Main-taining*	*Sus-taining*	*Life*	*Repre-sentative*	*Fellow*	*Honorary*	*Total*
Alabama	3				7			10
Arizona	2	1						3
Arkansas	1							1
California	31	4	2	1				38
Colorado	8							8
Connecticut	15		4	1				20
Delaware	1	1						2
District of Columbia	7	2	2	1				12
Florida	6	1						7
Georgia	2			1				3
Illinois	17	3	2	1				23
Indiana	4				1			5
Iowa	16				2			18
Kansas	13							13
Kentucky	4							4
Louisiana	5		1					6
Maine	4							4
Maryland	14			1	14			29
Massachusetts	34	3	5	7	2			51
Michigan	9	2		1				12
Minnesota	5	1	1					12
Mississippi	2				1			3
Missouri	10							10
Montana	4							4
Nebraska	2		1					3
New Hampshire	3				4			7
New Jersey	18	1	6	1				26
New Mexico	2							2
New York City	117	25	42	21		3	3	211
New York State	33		7	2	3		1	46
North Carolina	9							9
North Dakota	2							2
Ohio	23	2	3	1	24			53
Oklahoma	7	2	3		5			17
Oregon	11			1	2			14
Pennsylvania	39	1	2		3			45
Philippines	1							1
Rhode Island	7		1	1				9
South Carolina	5							5
South Dakota	2							2
Tennessee	5		1	1				7
Texas	25	1	1	2	8			37
Utah	2							2
Vermont	1							1
Virginia	10		2					12
Washington	4			1				5
West Virginia	8	1		1				10
Wisconsin	9	1						10
Canada	6	1						7
China	1							1
Colombia, S. A.	1							1
England	5							5
France	1							1
Germany	3							3
Holland				1				1
	579	53	86	47	76	3	4	848

Of this membership 43 are Libraries.
In addition are 62 Library and University subscribers to the Bulletin, not members.
There are 22 Affiliated Organizations.
There are 2 Sustaining Organizations (100% membership).
Three states have no membership, viz.: Idaho, Nevada, Wyoming.

Annual Report of the Foundation Committee

The membership of the Foundation Committee was completely recently and consists of Mrs. Kidder, Vice Chairman, Mr. Heine, Temporary Chairman and Messrs. Charles C. Bauer and S. H. Kress.

The function of this Committee is to carry out one of the important aims of the Association, viz., to gather funds for the purpose of building a Shakespeare Memorial Center to house the various activities of the Association.

Prof. Adams' vision of the Shakespeare Center described in the October Bulletin has aroused much interest and the Committee hopes this fall to start to enlarge and crystallize this interest.

ARTHUR HEINE,
Temporary Chairman.

Curator's Annual Report

The year 1930-1931 brought to the Shakespeare Association of America a great loss in the death of Mrs. Tunis G. Bergen, Curator for the Association. Mrs. Bergen was much interested in gathering together items which might be of interest to Association members in anticipation of the time when the Association could afford a library of its own.

During the year very little was added to the library. But, in memory of Mrs. Bergen and her interest in the Association, Mrs. Peters, the niece of Mrs. Bergen, presented to the Association the Staunton facsimile copy of the first folio of Shakespeare.

OLIVE I. CARTER, *Curator.*

The Club Forum

CONDUCTED BY
MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS

MISS M. T. DALLAM sends a most interesting history of the Baltimore Shakespeare Society which came into existence in 1924. The first president was Mrs. Arthur Lee Shreve, and Dr. Baker of Goucher College succeeded her. Once a month the members gathered at the College Club, read from one of the great plays, and took part in a discussion which was led by a member who had been appointed the previous meeting. Occasionally the club was privileged to hear Shakespearean scholars of note, Dr. Tupper of Lafayette College, and Dr. Miller of Goucher. Men and women enjoy the delightful informality of the sessions of this club. I think it was Clive Bell who wrote that the degree of civilization attained by any group is measured by the ability of the members of that group to carry on a conversation. If there be any truth in that assertion, there is a quality in the discussions of the Baltimore group which stands the suggested test.

* * *

Dr. R. L. Brantley, head of the English department of Bessie Tift College, Forsyth, Georgia, was the organizer of the Shakespeare Club which is one of the cultural assets of that community and institution. The enrollment is now forty, only students making an average of "B" in all English subjects being admitted. Miss Mary Emma Blanchard of Augusta, is the president. Dr. Brantley recently addressed them on the subject of "Shakespeare on the Modern Stage"—an excellent preparation for appreciation of the performance of the Ben Greet Players in *Twelfth Night* and *Hamlet.*

* * *

Mrs. Hubert L. Bolen writes most interestingly of the activities of the Shakespeare Club of Oklahoma City. (This group was mentioned briefly in the last issue of The Bulletin.) They plan to found a Shakespeare Center. The club will give programs for all civic organizations desiring them and give the proceeds to increase the fund for the center. Mrs. Bolen writes that the club has just closed a good year and has fine prospects for the future. She is herself a writer and lecturer of note and is giving her services generously toward the "consummation devoutly to be wished." Among the subjects which Mrs. Bolen discusses on the platform are "Traveling with Shakespeare as Guide," "Parallel Study of Shakespeare and the Bible," "Shakespeare, a Gift and Giver to the World."

Miss Ellen Little of Norwalk, Ohio, is a landscape gardener who has visited every Shakespeare garden in the world and she has made a careful study of them. A unique performance is to be given at twilight under the auspices of the Garden Club of Norwalk, the evening of

June 29th, in Miss Little's own garden, which is one of remarkable originality and beauty. Members of the Toledo Shakespeare Club will produce two forest scenes from *As You Like It,* two scenes, the balcony and the lovers' farewell, from *Romeo and Juliet* and, just as the full moon is rising over the garden, they will give the exquisite opening scene from the fifth act of *The Merchant of Venice,* beginning "How sweet the moonlight sleeps upon this bank." Between the scenes there will be fairy dances on the green sward. Lovers of Shakespeare and of beautiful gardens will drive to Norwalk from Cleveland, Sandusky, Oberlin, Elyria and other towns. Miss Little is now designing the Shakespeare garden which will be established on the spacious campus of the University of the City of Toledo.

* * *

Here is a fine and stimulating letter from Prof. Anna M. Sturmer, Kansas State Agricultural College, Manhattan, Kansas. She describes the celebration of the Shakespeare Birthday, arranged by the faculty of the institution in co-operation with the local chapter of the American Association of University Women. The 132 colleges and universities on the faculty roster were represented at the memorable dinner. The president of the college was toastmaster, there were appropriate songs, witty and wise speeches, and the greatest of Hamlet's soliloquies interpreted by a famous actor. This group of Shakespeare lovers is interested in establishing a Shakespeare Garden.

The Shakespeare Round Table of Bowling Green, Ohio, celebrated in May their twenty-fifth anniversary. Dr. Florence Williamson of the faculty of the State Normal School, is the new president. During the season of 1931-1932 this group plans to study *The Sonnets* and *Troilus and Cressida.*

* * *

The three Shakespeare Clubs of Portland, Oregon, the La Barre, the Bard of Avon and the Portland Shakespeare united in the observance of the birthday last spring. Following the dinner a varied and fitting program of speech and song was heard. We hope to print the history of all these clubs, but at present, we have only a record of the activities of the La Barre group. Mrs. Waldemar Seton is the newly elected president. An issue of the "Oregonian" contains a page of picture and word description of the Shakespeare Garden which is now taking form near Reed College Campus. This garden, the editorial writer declares, will translate "the loveliest of thoughts into a language all should be able to understand and to appreciate. It will bring to the present century a new appreciation of beauty." The place selected for the garden is an island in Crystal Springs Lake opposite Reed College grounds, a stone bridge leading to its sunny, glamorous spaces. Swans and other water-fowl will be protected there. The La Barre Shakespeare Club initiated the movement for the establishment of this beauty spot which the editor predicts will become one of the most famous features of the great northwest, worthy of "The City of Roses."